

Senate's CIA stance deserving of praise

It's one of those controversies that never seems to go away. Sign- and placard-bearing students protesting against CIA brutality, discrimination and terrorism. It's a scene that has been reported on campuses around the country for the past 25 years.

In recent months, arguments against CIA recruiting at the University have become more strident. Earlier this school year, two students were arrested for blocking the entrance to the room where CIA officials were holding interviews.

Although the CIA hasn't been on campus since November, the furor has refused to die away. Developments literally happen from day to day, and with the CIA planning another recruiting session on campus in March, opponents are stoking themselves for another battle.

Student opposition to the CIA has a large following on campus, although there are differences on CIA recruitment. Some favor allowing the organization to recruit if it cleaned up its hiring process, denounced sexual discrimination and complied with the University's equal opportunity statutes. Some just want the CIA to be banned from campus, period.

Last week, the Student Senate added to the controversy by passing a proposal that recruitment agencies (read CIA) would have to comply with the University's hiring policy. If any group continued to discriminate while hiring, they would not be allowed to recruit on campus.

The senate's action deserves nothing but praise. Although it was framed with the CIA in mind, it is a fair law. It makes the University's policy very simple and up-front: if you don't obey, you don't come on campus. Simple.

In the past, the CIA has claimed exemption from any sort of hiring laws. Although it is a government agency, albeit a notorious one, it should not get any special treatment. If the CIA recruiters refuse to sign the non-discrimination statement, they should not be allowed to come on campus. That means they can't hold interviews. That means they can't advertise for recruits. That means they can't even step on campus.

That's fair.

In March, the issue will resolve itself, one way or the other. The Senate's proposal really amounts to a ban of the organization. When faced with a non-discrimination statement in the past, at schools like Princeton and the NYU law school, the CIA has refused to sign. The CIA was then banned from recruiting on those campuses. Because it's highly unlikely the CIA will throw off years of past policy for the sake of recruiting at the University, the March visit will probably be the last one.

And if that's what they want, fine.



Hospital's new tenants lack 'character'

There's trouble again in the West University neighborhood, where Sacred Heart General Hospital's list of crimes — real or imagined — continues to grow.

The trouble this time: Sacred Heart has finalized leases with the stores that will occupy the retail space in the hospital's new parking garage. These stores include a haircut salon, a flower store and a copy shop.

Those new tenants anger three businesses that sit just about across the street from the garage. Not surprisingly, the three angry businesses are a haircut salon, a flower store and a copy shop. West University neighborhood residents are also upset with the continuing shopping mall-ization of their crowded and once quaint borough.

The businesses are upset because they fear Sacred Heart deliberately brought in the competition to drive them out so the hospital could buy their land to further a nefarious scheme to turn West University into one big parking lot.

That kind of paranoia is unjustified. Sacred Heart certainly has a need to expand, but they've done so on land they already owned, as is their right. Currently, the hospital has demonstrated no interest in further development. The threatened stores are also

well established and seem likely to outlast any competition. For example, Eugene's Flower Home has been around since 1922, and The Copy Shop has held its own against monolithic Kinko's.

To build its garage, Sacred Heart drove out colorful eateries, such as Poppi's and Lenny's Nosh Bar, and unique businesses such as clothing resale stores or organic groceries. We're not saying the hospital did this deliberately; many of the businesses closed on their own accord. Yet the neighborhood's character is undeniably different now, and disappointingly, Sacred Heart did nothing to encourage former businesses to return, or to seek other businesses offering services that don't already exist in the area.

Sacred Heart is not an entirely inhuman organization. After all, it's a hospital, not a toxic-waste producing arms manufacturer. And when it considered possible tenants for its garage retail space, it was deliberately careful to not bring a shop competing with its tenants in its old garage. In the future, we hope the hospital shows that kind of regard and consideration for the West University neighborhood as a whole, and not just those stores under the hospital's aegis.

Letters

Lighten up

I find it very interesting that so many men feel they are qualified to judge how a woman should treat her body. The anti-abortion barrage by Kevin Allen (ODE, Feb. 7) exemplifies the continuing male-dominated society that survives today.

We need to realize that women are very capable of making decisions as well as men. And Allen should have a little more sensitivity than to call pro-choice advocates "anti-life radicals." How does the label pro-oppression reactionary strike you?

Abortion is an issue that needs to be decided between the couple and not the masses. If we begin to limit the ability for a woman to live her life without the burden of a child, where will we stop in limiting human rights? Until someone proves to me in a rational manner that life begins at conception, I feel abortion should be a lawful option for women as long as the child is dependent

upon the mother for physical survival.

In the most recent Harper's Index (Oregonian, Feb. 4), 69 percent of the Republican congresswomen said they were pro-choice. The Republican party is generally thought to be pro-life by choice, but this again shows the dominance of men and their beliefs. We need to listen to the side abortion affects the most: women.

So come on guys, lighten up. Abortion is a heart-wrenching enough issue without a bunch of super-moral men screaming that they know best. Let women make the decision.

Kevin Miller
Political science

Sexually active

Would you want your junior-high or high school daughter to be sexually active? For most people, the answer would be no. Why not? Probably so she wouldn't get pregnant by some guy that will disavow any knowledge of the affair.

But wait, he's a great guy who'll never do anything like that, and besides, there's always abortion. So why can't she just go on living a sexually active, carefree lifestyle such as the one by Jane Roe, as portrayed by Holly Hunter in the TV movie *Roe vs. Wade*?

Sure, it would be ideal if all women pursued an education, started a career, and became economically and emotionally stable before having to support a child; especially in the inner-city. But doesn't such a dream mean we'd want society to be like that? Or is sexual activity a physical and emotional necessity in relationship? Isn't love something that comes from the mind and the heart, or is it a feeling that originates below the waist?

Gary Hoh
Eugene

Used

I am writing this because I feel that I have been led along, used, then thrown away.

At the beginning of January, I interviewed for a job at the new Albertsons on Hilyard Street. At the interview, I was promised "as many hours as I could handle" and offered full-time employment during the summer.

However, after three weeks of employment, I have found myself laid off because the company purposefully hired one-third too many employees to cover themselves for their "grand opening," knowing that they would cut them when business died down. Of course, no one mentioned this at the interview.

The result is that many hard-working and competent people, many of whom gave up steady jobs, were kicked out through no fault of their own. These people, many of whom have a family to support, were given just a couple of hours notice and no severance pay.

Albertsons will counter these charges by saying there is a 30-day probationary period. But what a 30-day probationary period means to rational minds is

that if you screw up, you're out. It is not a correct excuse for hiring, then laying off large amounts of people. Why didn't they advertise the positions as temporary?

Law students: Is there any recourse against an employer for this kind of deceitful practice? Please tell me about it.

Martin Ryder
Architecture

Juxtaposition

Wonderful job on the cover of the Feb. 13 *Emerald*! The headline reads: "Students express mixed emotions to Mandela's release." The picture next to it shows art student Leslie Ware laughing her head off.

Nice juxtaposition there. This one really deserves to be sent to the *Columbia Journal* (the place that puts out such wonderful books as "Squad Helps Dog Bite Victim.")

James Drew
Computer Science